

[29] From: RStrickd 12/7/92 11:16AM (15792 bytes: 97 ln, 1 fl)
To: PRaack
cc: BBrown
Subject: carrier costs

----- Message Contents -----

Text item 1:

Lenny-

The most recent estimate of costs for FY92 (approx \$266K) did not show that the ATSDR costs (approx. \$28K) were included. Are these FY92 costs?
No. These costs are from fiscal years 89 through 91.

Why didn't they show up?

When we request cost documentation from the financial management office. Financial management downloads its computers and provides us the cost information. ATSDR costs are not billed directly to EPA. Therefore, if financial management is not told to contact ATSDR for the cost information, then that information is not picked. Upon my review of the costs a few weeks ago, it was then that I noticed that the ATSDR costs were not present. I then contacted ATSDR and had them send us the costs.

Are there other costs that are due that are not showing up? Peter, frankly, there is always the possibility of additional costs showing up. For instance, if the contractor has additional work to perform and bills the Agency at a later time, Cost Recovery or Financial Management or Contracts would not be aware of this. However, if there are any work assignment that have not been completed the RPM would know. Therefore, the RPM would be in the position to know if any additional costs are outstanding in regards to work assignments. Furthermore, neither the above list Regional offices would know, as far as I know, when the contractor will bill the Agency.

On the otherhand, I could talk with the Contract Officer and see if they think any additional costs are due? Furthermore, I could talk with the RPM and determine if all work had been completed. Do you desire this?

Also, Beth had requested that the costs, such as Dynamac and ATSDR, that are for work done in different fiscal years be set out for the corresponding year in which the work did occur. In other words, how much of the \$166K from Dynamac is for work in FY89, FY90, etc.?

I am not sure the Cost Recovery Section can do this request for Dynamac with any level of confidence. As you are probably are familiar with, the SPUR and SCORES are only reflective of cost that are paid and not reflective in terms of when the costs are actually incurred. Also, the cost documentation we have for Dynamac, i.e., invoices, treasury schedules, and treasury confirmation, again only support what costs were actually paid. The Cost Recovery Section does not contain records that are responsive to that request.



10663383

However, what I can attempt to do is to reconcile the Dynamac costs with the monthly reports in RPM possession.

However, this can be a fairly laborious task. To perform this task, I may have to put aside other assignments that the Cost Recovery Section has an expressed interest in. Therefore, I will likely require the consent of my management to perform this task. Shall I talk to my management about performing the fiscal year breakdown for Dynamac.

I have attached a breakdown of the ATSDR costs. Understand that the breakdown is a draft and is in a WordPerfect file. I have discovered that ATSDR may have erred in their calculation of indirect costs. However, the error is only in pennies; no major numbers. I am requesting ATSDR to examine the error and to account for the one to four cent error factor. But rest assured, the dollar figure is fairly correct.

This is very important so that even if all costs are "incurred" in FY92, we can determine when the work was done.

Also, what is the best estimate of when a bill for FY92 will be ready to go out the door?
Probably by COB January 15, 1993.

Also, can you find out from other sites that have a proposed remedy of \$5-7 million, how much we have billed for oversight of RD/RA and over what period of time (how long did the oversight occur)? This, too, is very important to find out.

Pete, this request is a very unusual. Could you state how and why this is important?

Pete, in the past Lenny has performed the duties of oversight only. However, since Lenny is now an EPM, he has been taken off this Site. You can address your concerns for this Site to me.

I do have Leonard Chemical, so let me know if you want to talk about it.

Thanks

Pete